APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,569	02/26/2002	Stephen Savitzky	015358-007100US	8958

20350   7590   11/23/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
GEREZGIHER, YEMANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/085,569	SAVITZKY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yemane M. Gerezgiher	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 September 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,6-17,19-28 and 33_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,6-17,19-28 and 33_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _26 February 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .   6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The response received on 09/14/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-4, 6-

17, 19-28 and 33 are now pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Note: If further prosecution on the merits of the instant application is pursued,
Applicant is strongly encouraged to further incorporate (limitations in parallel)
into the independent claims, to include patentably distinct functional
limitations or features in order to overcome the applied prior art of record. For
instance, the examiner notes (in the specification of this instant application,
Specification Page 12, ¶¶47-49), limitations which read as follows:

> [47]   After the desired edits are made to the resource and possibly to the
> distribution list and the notification list, the <u>client uploads the modified
> resource along with the session ID to the server, step 506. If it is determined
> that the server is not the origin server for the resource (step 501), then the
> server uploads the resource to the origin server</u>, step 503. Recall the DRI
> contains the machine name of the origin server, and so the origin server can be
> accessed for uploading by referring to the DRI portion of the URL associated
> with the resource.

> [48]   In the case of an architecture such as shown in FIG. 2 where the server
> containing the modified resource (say for example, server 206) and the origin
> server (say for example, server 202) are mutually inaccessible, <u>the modified
> resource can be propagated back to the origin server via the intermediate
> servers. Information about the chain of intermediate servers back to the origin
> server is contained in the distribution list</u>.

> [49] When the origin server receives the modified resource, some form of version
> control processing can be performed. Following are some basic ways to handle
> version control of a modified resource:

These functional limitations (underlined above) directed to the process of

distributing a modified version of a first document by determining if the server

is the origin server that created the original first document and if the server is

not the original server, transferring/uploading the modified version of the first

document to the original server by propagation of modified resources back to

the origin server via the intermediate servers (See Fig. 5, steps # 501 through

#510). Examiner strongly suggest a claim amendment composed of the

highlighted functional limitations above, which are associated with the

distribution of the modified document process, in order to overcome the

rejection over the applied prior art of record and advance prosecution of this

application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall
> not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-7, 10-12, 24, 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. (US 20020111911 A1) hereinafter referred to as Kennedy in view of Tabuchi (U.S. Patent Number 6,446,093) and further in view of Karaev et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,518) hereinafter referred to as Karaev.

As per claims 1 and 10, Kennedy disclosed: A method for distributing documents, (Title and Abstract) comprising: producing a first identifier, the first identifier including first information indicative of a first server; [Fig. 3, Page 1 ¶0005 and Page 3, ¶s 0033-0038, Kennedy disclosed a server creating a list and transmitting the generated list to a user, since the list is transmitted via a communication network in a TCP/IP based web communication utilizing a global communication network (the Internet) (see Page 2, ¶0028), the transmitted list/document over the internet inherently comprises some sort of source identifier such as a URL/URI or other header identifier that shows to the source of the list/document]; transmitting the first identifier from the first server to a client based upon at least a request from the client to create the document on the first server in an original document format, the client associating the first identifier with the first document [Kennedy, Figs. 1, 3 and 5; Page 3, ¶0035, Page 4, ¶0043, Page 5, ¶0055 and ¶0060]; transmitting a copy of the first document to the first server [Fig. 3, Page 3, ¶0038 and Page 4, ¶0045]; transmitting a commit request to the first server [Page 3, ¶0041

through Page 4, ¶0043]; and in response to the commit request, the first server becoming responsive to download requests from one or more distribution servers for one or more copies of the first document, the download requests containing the first information [Page 3, ¶0038-0039, ¶0041, Page 4, ¶0045, Page 5, ¶0055 and ¶0060, Kennedy disclosed distributing the document to the recipients in accordance with the distribution list associated with the document].

Kennedy substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. However, Kennedy was silent about sending a commit signal to the server. However, an artisan now working with the invention of Kennedy can clearly see that Kennedy disclosed receiving user selection of distribution addresses/list; and once the selection is done and sent back to the controller server; the distribution of the document is performed (see Page 3, ¶0035-0041). Nevertheless, it is commonly known and widely practiced feature to send a commit signal in a communication network. By definition, a commit command is an Oracle ™ reserved word instructing the database to save all changes made to the database. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make use of a commit signal/command and have the teachings of Kennedy in order to notify/inform a file server about a completion of any modification made to the information data and to save the changes made.

The teachings of already modified Kennedy substantially disclosed substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. However, was silent about an identifier adapted for association with a first document, the first document including first information indicative of a first server configured to create the first document in an original document format. However, as evidenced by the teachings of Tabuchi, identifier adapted for association with a document, the document including first information indicative of a first server configured to create the first document in an original document format was known in the art at the time the invention was made (see Tabuchi, Abstract, Column 3, Lines 24-64, Column 32, Line 29 through Column 33, Line 48, and Column 34, Lines 11-49). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Tabuchi related to document object identifier identifying original document creation associated with a document server and further modify Kennedy in order to better manage a document shared in distributed system comprising a document server and plurality of clients over the distribution network (Tabuchi, Column 45-48).

The already combined teachings of Kennedy and Tabuchi hereinafter referred to as "Kennedy-Tabuchi", substantially disclosed the invention as recited, including receiving a distribution list associated with the first document, the distribution list identifying a second server; transmitting a copy of the document from the first server to the second server identified by the

distribution list [uploading a first document to a central (first) server and along with the document including a distribution list, where a copy of the first document is distributed to plurality of servers (i.e., mail application server, print server and the like, see Kennedy, Figs. 1-4), See Kennedy Page 3, ¶0038-0039, ¶0041, Page 4, ¶0045, Page 5, ¶0055 and ¶0060, distributing the document to the recipients in accordance with the distribution list associated with the document]. However, the already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi failed to explicitly teach transmitting a copy of the document from the first server to the second server identified by the distribution list, **the first server and the second server thereafter responsive to one or more download requests for one or more copies of the first document,** as amended in the claim. Kennedy rather disclosed the printer and print services and other publishing services, where there is no clear indication of such servers/services are servers that are responsive to download requests from client devices for downloading a copy of the document in distribution.

Nevertheless, as evidenced by the teachings of Karaev, transmitting a copy of the document from the first server to the second server identified by the distribution list, the first server and the second server thereafter responsive to one or more download requests for one or more copies of the first document was known in the art at the time the invention was made [see Karaev, Fig. 5, and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 39, Line 6, contributor devices A-C contributing a document to be distributed to plurality of servers and recipients

based on server and authorized subscriber lists associated with the document,

uploading the document to a first server (Fig. 5, contributor servers A|B),

where any one of the contributor servers A|B is responsible to further transmit

a copy of the document to the plurality of other viewer servers (Fig. 5, viewer

servers A 30, A 32, and the all the servers are responsive to a download request

from plurality of the servers for a copy of the contributed published document

at the subscriber client requesting devices]. Thus, it is respectfully submitted

that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to take the teachings of Karaev and have   the

teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi because such a modification provides an

electronic information distribution that allows remote users to receive and

access/download a published document from a respective severs enabling

customized views of the document formats in a secure, a flexible and robust

manner (see Karaev, Column 3, Lines 5-20).

Claim 24, has substantially similar limitations as in claims 1 and 10.

Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale. Further, since the invention of

Kennedy was carried out using a computer system, a computer program/code

tangibly embodied in a computer readable medium, having therein a series of

executable codes and when executed by the computer system to perform the

claimed invention as recited in claims 1 and 10 was inherently disclosed by the

already combined teachings.

As per claims 2, the already combined teachings disclosed the receiving the distribution list associated with the first document, comprises receiving the distribution list identifying one or more servers different from the first server [Kennedy, Page 3, ¶0038-0039 and Page 4, ¶0045 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 62].

As per claim 3, the already combined teachings disclosed the notification list identifying one or more users [Kennedy, Figs. 4&5 and Page 3, ¶0041-0043 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 628].

As per claims 4, 21, 26 and 27, the already combined teachings disclosed initiating a sequence of operations between the first server and a second server so that the first document is transferred from the first server to the second server in the original format, the download request including the first information [Page 4, ¶0046-0048 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 628].

As per claims 6, and 11, the already combined teachings disclosed transferring the first document to at least one intermediate server to produce an intermediate copy in the original format, and transferring the intermediate copy from the at least one intermediate server to the second server [Page 1, ¶0011, page 2, ¶0021-0023, Page 4, ¶0045-0047, Fig. 1, Page 3, ¶0035, Page 4, ¶0043, Page 5, ¶0055 and ¶0060, Kennedy disclosed transmitting a copy of the document to at least one of the document distribution providers, and the distribution provider transmitting the copy further to the distribution service].

As per claims 7, and 12, the already combined teachings disclosed informing the second server of a distribution request [Page 5, ¶0054-0056]; and in response to the distribution request, the second server initiating a sequence of operations with the first server to transfer the first document to the second server [Kennedy, Page 5, ¶0057-0061 and Figs.1, 2].

5.   Claims 8, 9, 13-15-17, 19, 20-23, 25, 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. (US 20020111911 A1) in view of Tabuchi (U.S. Patent Number 6,446,093) in view of Karaev et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,802,518) and further in view of Heddaya et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,250,481) hereinafter referred to as Heddaya.

Claim 15, has substantially similar limitations as in claim 1 above. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale claim 1 is rejected above. The already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi and Karaev substantially disclosed the claim as recited. Furthermore, associating a second identifier with the first identifier including the first information was known in the art at the time the invention was made. For example, the WayBackMachine ©/™ (Internet archive, which can be accessed by links (www.archive.org OR www.waybackmachine.org) functions in that exact manner (e.g. archiving a document with "http://www.mit.edu/" would produce the following identifiers http://web.archive.org/web/20041118011936/http://mit.edu/

[associating a second identifier of a document (http://web.archive.org/web) and the first identifier identifying the first (original, http://mit.edu/) identifier including the information in the first document]. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the teachings of Kennedy related to document distribution with addressing of the identifiers in order to preserve the original source identifier of a document. The already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi and Karaev substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. .

However, already combined teachings were silent about receiving a second document, the second document being a second version of the first document, retaining the first and second documents and distributing the second version of the document to the plurality of distribution servers. However, as evidenced by the teachings of Heddaya, detecting a change or. modification to a document at a first server and if so, in response to the step of detecting, a second computer/server initiating a sequence of operations with the first server to get an updated version of the document presence of an updated document at the first server; and where the first server transmits the updated document to other distribution servers was known in the art at the time the invention was made. See Heddaya, col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 48 and col. 16, lines 1-63. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Heddaya related redistributing of updated documents

among plurality of intermediate distribution server and have the already combined teachings of Kennedy-Karaev and Tabuchi, because such a modification would "eliminate the need for servers to be pooled periodically by large number of cache servers to check for content freshness, thereby reducing the load on the servers" (Heddaya col. 4, lines 44-47).

As per claim 16, wherein the first plurality of servers is the same as the second plurality of servers (Kennedy, Fig. 1, document distribution servers)

As per claim 17, wherein the first plurality of servers is different from the second plurality of servers (Kennedy, page 4, ¶0046-0047).

As per Claim 19, wherein the second document is associated with a second distribution list identifying the second plurality of servers (Kennedy, Page 3, ¶0036-0038 and page 5, ¶0060-0061 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 62).

Claims 20 and 25 recite limitations substantially similar as limitations within claim 15 above. Therefore, they are rejected with the same rationale.

As per claim 21, the already combined teachings disclosed initiating a sequence of operations between the first server and a second server so that the first document is transferred from the first server to the second server in the original format, the download request including the first information [Page 4, ¶0046-0048 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 628].

As per claim 22, Kennedy disclosed transferring the first document to at least one intermediate server to produce an intermediate copy in the original format, and transferring the intermediate copy from the at least one intermediate server to the second server [Page 1, ¶0011, page 2, ¶0021-0023, Page 4, ¶0045-0047, Fig. 1, Page 3, ¶0035, Page 4, ¶0043, Page 5, ¶0055 and ¶0060, Kennedy disclosed transmitting a copy of the document to at least one of the document distribution providers, and the distribution provider transmitting the copy further to the distribution service].

As per claim 23, Kennedy disclosed informing a second server of a transfer request [Page 5, ¶0054-0056]; and in response thereto the second server initiating a sequence of operations with the originating server to transfer the first document to the second server [Page 5, ¶0057-0061 and Figs.1, 2 and Karaev, Fig. 5 and Column 37, Line 62 through Column 38, Line 62].

Claim 33 has limitations substantially similar to claim 15. Thus, claim 33 is rejected with the same rationale claim 15 is rejected above. The already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi and Karaev substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. However, the Kennedy-Tabuchi and/or Karaev was silent about receiving a second document representative of a version of the first document retaining the first and storing the second documents and distributing the second document to the one or more other servers identified by the distribution list. However, as evidenced by the teachings of Heddaya, detecting a change or modification to a document at a first server and if so, in

response to the step of detecting, a second computer/server initiating a sequence of operations with the first server to get an updated version of the document presence of an updated document at the first server; and where the first server transmits the updated document to other distribution servers indicated in the distribution list was known in the art at the time the invention was made. See Heddaya, col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 48 and col. 16, lines 1-63. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Heddaya related redistributing of updated documents among plurality of intermediate distribution server and have the already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi and Karaev, because such a modification would "eliminate the need for servers to be pooled periodically by large number of cache servers to check for content freshness, thereby reducing the load on the servers" (Heddaya col. 4, lines 44-47).

As per claims 8, 9, 13, 14 and 28, the already combined teachings of Kennedy-Tabuchi and Karaev substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. However, was silent about randomly generating a naming component of an identifier; detecting a change or modification to a document at a first server and if so, in response to the step of detecting, a second computer/server initiating a sequence of operations with the first server to get an updated version of the document presence of an updated document at the first server;

and where the first server transmits the updated document to other distribution servers.

However, as correctly admitted by the inventive entity (see specification on page 7, lines 11-16), randomly generating an identifier or a naming component of an identifier was commonly known technique in the art of computer networks. Furthermore, as evidenced by the teachings of Heddaya, detecting a change or modification to a document at a first server and if so, in response to the step of detecting, a second computer/server initiating a sequence of operations with the first server to get an updated version of the document presence of an updated document at the first server; and where the first server transmits the updated document to other distribution servers was known in the art at the time the invention was made. See Heddaya, col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 48 and col. 16, lines 1-63. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Heddaya related redistributing of updated documents among plurality of intermediate distribution server and have the already combined teachings of Kennedy and Tabuchi, because such a modification would "eliminate the need for servers to be pooled periodically by large number of cache servers to check for content freshness, thereby reducing the load on the servers" (col. 4, lines 44-47).

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yemane M. Gerezgiher whose telephone number is (571) 272-3927. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Y. Gerezgiher
Patent Examiner

WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100